

AUG 30 2010

Remarks: (patent application 10/735,333 filing date 12/12/2003 – Request for Continued Examination - In response to observations made on USPTO letter dated 11/19/2009)

Page 2/ Point 2: In view of your advice to hire a patent attorney, it is to bring to your kind notice that I have already scouted around and discussed the matter with a couple of attorneys after getting references from the USPTO database. The main reason that I continue to work on my own as an independent inventor after discussion with the attorneys is that they advised me to continue on my own as this case in particular was already at an advanced stage. The decision to file for RCE was arrived at after consultation with them, but they advised me to continue on my own.

Page 2/ Point 3: Regarding your claim objections using the future tense, the same has been addressed and the revised claims addressing this objection are attached.

Page 3/ Point 4 onwards: While I appreciate that the revised filing of claims has invited review afresh and your due diligence at citing new grounds for rejection citing Takedisha and Turner references, please note that both of the newly cited references are not directly or even indirectly relevant to the present invention in view of the following:

1. Turner simply refers to anomalies in the existing US postal service system and suggests ways and means to improve the security of it through collection of personal information about the individual or organization and addressing the security issue by issuing encrypted stamps and envelopes etc. that correlate to the individual or business requesting the issue of postal stamps or envelopes. Please note that though Turner in his short application does bring forth an appreciable system and methods to address an important issue related to security in the postal services system, Turner does not per se specify any details of how this system can be launched or implemented, and essentially Turner merely remains an abstract level suggestion to collect data related to person, business, or organization, and is silent on the design details and implementation part. It is neither similar in scope, nor in design detail when compared with the present invention.
2. Takeshita merely suggests a system for a secure session management with user authentication while exchanging data between a user and a networked computer application, and bears absolutely no direct or indirect relevance to the present application.
3. While the postal system security is an important issue, the suggested Turner application can be one of the UIN (Universal Identification Number)

potential usages of the current invention, as UIN does provide the details necessary to implement what Turner suggests. UIN system disclosed in the current invention has multiple usages. In that sense, Turner can apply UIN, but not the other way around. To the extent that UIN system holds the potential for several applications, postal security system can be one of those potential applications.

4. The postal security system as suggested by Turner is confined to suggestion for issue of encrypted stamps, envelopes, and labels in the US, has not been exclusively detailed either in the design or in the implementation and is not intuitively extensible to global usage as a uniquely issued identification number to everyone on the planet and to be used as a global cross reference identifier, and bears no distinct resemblance to the present invention. It is in some ways similar to the suggestion by Tam for a system to securely access the personal data by a pre-determined finger sequence. It can not be construed or assumed that it would be obvious to anyone knowledgeable in the field to modify the teachings of Turner, Takeshita, and Tam (previously referenced) to come out with the present invention.
5. Turner suggests the system specific to address US Postal system security issue, and is not a universal system that uniquely identifies each and every human being on the planet and issues a unique number that is not recycled. Even in scope, Turner suggestions are limited to US Postal System, and not applicable or extensible to a global identity establishment, issue and verification system as suggested in the present invention.
6. Turner makes broad suggestions towards potential other usage of the system that can basically be created for postal security system, but is essentially silent about any details of how such a system can be created or implemented. To that extent, systems like Social Security Number or Tax Identification Number and State Driver's license already exist, and the same can also be extended to implement the system suggested by Turner, or the potential usage that he suggests over and above the postal security system. Turner is based only on broad suggestions and abstract concepts that lack any design or implementation level details.
7. There is no direct conflict between Turner and the present application, as each one addresses a very specific and different problem space and solution. The problem space suggested by Turner is very specific to postal security system, though he makes some broad suggestions to its extension. The solution suggested by Turner is only a broad suggestion on what type of data can be collected, but there are no specific details.
8. None of Takeshita, Turner, and Tam, either separately or jointly put together suggest or provide details about the system that is disclosed in

the present invention. Each one of these patent applications has a different focus, scope, and intent. Takeshita describes a system for secured session for a user interaction in an online networked access to data, and more specifically related to content updates, and has no similarity with the current application. Turner outlines an abstract solution to achieve secured postal system. Tam describes a system to access personal data in a secured manner by use of pre-determined finger sequence.

9. Even if one was to take an abstracted and comprehensive view of the sum total of all the three references to Takeshita, Turner, and Tam cited by you as the existing and fresh grounds for rejection in view of the revised claims, the combined sum total of these three references falls much short of reaching anywhere close in comprehending a unique and global perspective and scope of the proposed scope and disclosed detail by the current invention.

The existence of a seat, straight bars or hallow tubes, a chain, and round objects like wheels can not lead to an assumed conclusion that it would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the art to create a bicycle out of assembling these bits and pieces of the objects of current existence. Indeed, any such assumed conclusion would be an exaggerated over-interpretation. A wheel is a great invention by itself and can be used in multiple ways. A seat also fulfills a purpose. Hallow tubes and straight or bend bars can also be used in multiple ways for different applications. Despite the existence of all these objects, the conceptualization, design, and assembly of a working bicycle as a vehicle of utility by itself is an invention that creates a whole new world of application out of combining existing objects.

Correlating with this example, no one can deny that several algorithms already exist for number generation, several methods exist for secured data capture and access, and so do the systems for secured data transmission and session management. But each one of those is like an object of existence, like the seat, the hallow tube, or the chain, and the round object. The present invention can be viewed from the perspective of bringing a whole new concept and meaning to these objects of existence and assembling those with newly created ones in a manner of utility that meets the current and unmet needs of humanity in several ways from eradicating global terrorism to keeping patients safe in hospital to preventing identity fraud to human and patient monitoring and tracking in a non-invasive manner, to preventing child abduction, to an integrated card management system, to avoiding the need for travel for visa and document issue and verification, thus saving the environment of our planet, among several others.

Saying Turner application as secured postal system and potential other usage is equivalent of quoting a bar to be used as a lever to help lift weight and can possibly also be used for other applications.

Saying Tam as secured method to capture and access personal information by a pre-determined and recorded sequence or Takeshita as a secured session management system for secured data access and content update is equivalent to quoting a seat can be used for resting a human being and can possibly be used for something else as well.

Thus, to that extend, even taking the combined view of Takeshita, Turner, and Tam as a whole does not constitute a suggestion that is anywhere near the invention disclosed by the current application. There are several aspects to the current application that are unique to it, some examples like:

- The UIN number generation and the issue of one unique UIN number to everyone on the planet – the random number generation is not the key here, it is the unique combination of UIN generation algorithm and issue of UIN to every single human being on the planet, its longevity beyond life of the individual, and its nature as a global cross reference indicator.
- The segregation of data for personal, public, health record, and confidential usage and its secured access to seekers on a “need to know basis” to solve many a currently unmet human needs for applications like will verification, land revenue records, settling property disputes, and court cases involving paternity, personal identification, and forensic data. The confidential database is not shared through online access to prevent hacking attempts, and is accessed only through a legal order to obtain the information.
- The technology applications built with UIN system as the base for human and patient unique identification, identity verification, human and patient monitoring, tracking, rescue, preventing child abduction, credit card verification system, and integrated card management system, among several others.
- The issue of UIN card that acts as a life savior in case of a medical emergency as it contains vital medical data on the inside surface.
- The unique usage of UIN as a global cross-reference identifier to solve Interpol cases and meet the requirements of “Real ID Act” besides several other applications for visa tracking, detection of infiltration, unauthorized access to a secured territory or place etc., and accessing or referencing patient records across hospitals in a secured manner.
- Warning, alert, and rescue in case of natural disasters and other emergency situations like external aggression.